IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT HYDERABAD

THE HONOURBALE SRI JUSTICE ELIPE DHARMA RAO

W.P. No. 17834 OF 2005

Dated : 11th August, 2005

Between:

Pinnamaneni Ratnakumari

Petitioner

AND

The Mandal Revenue Officer,

Nandivada Mandal

Respondent

THE HONOURBALE SRI JUSTICE ELIPE DHARMA RAO

W.P. No. 17834 OF 2005

ORAL ORDER:

The petitioner apprehending dispossession at the hands of the

respondent, in respect of an extent of land Ac.1.53 cents in RS No. 683/1, an extent of Ac.2.50 cents in RS No. 686/2, an extent of Ac.681/2 and an extent of Ac.2.08 cents in RS No.696/2 of Elaparru Village, Nandivada Mandal, Krishna District, the petitioner filed this writ petition.

The case of the petitioner is that he purchased the above said lands for valuable consideration from different owners under registered sale deeds and his predecessors-in-title have obtained *No Objection Certificates* from the Revenue Divisional officer, Gudivada for selling the lands. While so, the respondent issued notice as to why he shall not be dispossessed from the said lands, which were purchased in violation of provisions of Act 9 of 1977. The petitioner got issued reply notice dated 16.7.2005, through an Advocate, contending inter alia that the provisions of the Act 9 of 1977 are not applicable to the lands in question.

Evidently, the reply got issued by the petitioner is pending consideration with the respondent. The said reply raises several debatable issues which are not adverted to by the respondent. In such circumstances, the respondent is directed to dispose of the representation (reply notice) dated 16.7.2005 issued through an Advocate and pass appropriate orders within twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Till such time, the respondent is directed not to dispossess the petitioner from the lands in question. With this direction, the writ petition stands disposed of. No order as to costs.

Elipe Dharma Rao, J.

August 11, 2005

MAS.